

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were previously pending. Claims 1-8 were previously withdrawn from consideration, claims 9-13 and 20-24 stand rejected, and claims 14-19 and 25-30 stand objected to. By virtue of this response, claims 1-8 have been cancelled, claims 9, 14, and 18-30 have been amended, and no new claims have been added. The amendments the claims are fully supported by the application as filed and no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 9-30 are currently under consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In particular, that claims 14-19 and 25-30 would be allowable if rewritten to include features of the base claim and any intervening claims. As indicated herein, Applicants have amended independent claims 9 and 20 to include some, but not all, of the features of claims 14 and 25 respectively. As provided below, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 20 are now allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 9-13 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Rahman (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064704) in view of Morris et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0063771).

Claim 9 has been amended herein for clarity and to include features similar to, but not identical, to original claim 14. In particular, claim 9 now recites a computer-implemented process including:

(b) searching a local knowledge object repository comprising local knowledge objects, each of the local knowledge objects being associated with the first user;

- (c) searching a central knowledge object repository comprising contributed knowledge objects;
- (d) returning to the first user a list of links for all matching local and contributed knowledge objects, said matching local and contributed knowledge objects being marked either local or published or listed;
- (e) allowing access to said matching local and contributed knowledge objects if the first user chooses a knowledge object marked local or published;
- (f) forwarding the first user's request to a second user and prompting the second user for authorization of access if the first user chooses a knowledge object marked listed from the list, the second user having control of access to the knowledge object marked listed; and
- (g) returning to the first user the chosen knowledge object marked listed if the second user allows access.

Claim 20 has been amended similarly, but not identically, as claim 9. The amendments are fully supported by the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, as described in paragraphs [0013] to [0017] of the application as published, a system and process is described for providing users the ability to search local repositories and central repositories for knowledge objects, which may include local or published knowledge objects, as well as listed (or brokered) knowledge objects that may be available from other users, and which may be accessed if permitted by a second user having control of the knowledge object. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Applicants submit that the combination of Rahman and Morris fails to disclose or suggest the features of claims 9 and 20 as presently recited. In particular, the combination fails to disclose or suggest features (f) or (g) recited in claim 9 (and similarly in claim 20).

With respect to feature (f) of claims 9 and 20, the Office Action states that Rahman discloses “enabling the first user to set an access attribute that indicates a limited ability for a second user to view the first image. The first image may selectively be provided to the second user in a

secure form in accordance with the access attribute, see abstract.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the recited portion of Rahman fails to disclose or suggest “**forwarding the first user's request to a second user**,” or “**prompting the second user for authorization of access** if the first user chooses a knowledge object marked listed from the list, the second user having control of access to the knowledge object marked listed,” as recited by claim 9. In other words, Rahman fails to disclose or suggest that a request for an image is forwarded to the user who uploaded the image, let alone, prompting the user for authorization of access by the requester of the chosen image. In contrast to the recited features, Rahman describes a system whereby the first user uploads an image and sets the access rights to the image via attributes, the access rights set in advance of a second user requesting the image. (*See, e.g.*, paragraph [0029]; Fig. 2.) Accordingly, Rahman fails to disclose or suggest that the user is forwarded the request for the image by a second user, nor that the user is prompted for authorization of access by a requestor.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Rahman fails to disclose or suggest “returning to the first user the chosen knowledge object marked listed if the second user allows access.” For instance, Rahman describes that the system receives a request from a user for an image, checks the access rights, and provides the image or denies the request. (*See, e.g.*, paragraph [0032]; Fig. 2.) Accordingly, Rahman describes that access is based on the previously submitted access attributes associated with the image, and is not based on prompting a user for approval and providing the image if access is allowed.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Rahman fails to disclose or suggest forwarding a request to the user who uploaded the image, and further fails to disclose or suggest prompting the user for authorization of access. The addition of Morris fails to cure the deficiencies of Rahman; in particular, Morris fails to disclose or suggest these features, or provide a suggestion or teaching for modifying Rahman to meet the features of claims 9 and 20. Accordingly, the rejection to claims 9 and 20 (and all claims depending therefrom) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 652182000100. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Electronic Signature /Christopher B. Eide/
Christopher B. Eide
Registration No.: 48,375
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5720